UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,737	08/13/2001	Andreas Weber	15436.253.31	9021

7590 02/27/2006

ERIC L. MASCHOFF
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
SINGH, DALZID E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2633	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/929,737	WEBER, ANDREAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dalzid Singh	2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of claims 34-42 and 46 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Ewen et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "LED based transmitters" of claims 1, 15, 25, 42 and 43 and the "...the filter components for coupling to the optical source..." of claims 4, 7, 8, 17, 18, 26 and 34 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an

application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 15 recite, "...where the optical detector has first and second operating modes such that in the first operating mode, the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with LED-generated optical signals, and in the second operating mode, the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with laser-generated optical signals" On page 12, lines 3-4, the specification discloses "optical receiver 208 and amplifier 210 have a plurality of operating modes." There is description provided of the relationship between the first operating mode and the LED or the second operating mode and the laser. Therefore, based on this, the claim(s)

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

5. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1 and 15 recite, "...where the optical detector has first and second operating modes such that in the first operating mode, the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with LED-generated optical signals, and in the second operating mode, the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with laser-generated optical signals" As originally filled, there is no structure or circuit diagram provided to teach a person of ordinary skill how the different operating modes are connected with the LEDs or the laser. The specification mention the use of LEDs, however, there is no structure or circuit diagram showing operating modes relating to LED. Therefore, the specification fails to provide enablement for claims 1 and 15.

Claims 25, 42 and 43 recite, "...the optoelectronic transceiver capable of interoperating with a first other transceiver utilizing laser based transmitters and respective receivers and the optoelectronic transceiver also capable of interoperating with a second other transceiver utilizing LED based transmitters and respective

receivers" As originally filled, there is no structure or circuit diagram provided to teach a person of ordinary skill how the interoperation between the transceiver utilizing LEDs or laser are performed. The specification mention the use of LEDs, however, there is no structure or circuit diagram showing operating modes relating to LED. Therefore, the specification fails to provide enablement for claims 25 and 43.

Claims 4, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 34 recites, "...the microprocessor providing control signals to the filter components for coupling to the optical source or the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus." Shown on Fig. 9 and discussed on page 12, lines 19-30 of the specification, the control signal is used to couple the filter component to the optical detector. There is no structure or circuit diagram provided to teach a person of ordinary skill how to couple the filter component to the optical source. Therefore, the specification fails to provide enabling disclosure for claim 34.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 34-42 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 32 recites the limitation "...the microprocessor providing control signals to the filter components for coupling to the optical source or the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial

communication bus." It is unclear if the control signals provided to the filter components is for selecting (coupling) either one of the optical source or the optical detector. Therefore, the claim is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 10, 13-16, 19, 20, 23-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aronson et al (US Pub No. 2002/0149821).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1 (as far as understood), Aronson et al disclose an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 2 comprising:

a data transmit line coupled to an optical source (103);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (102), wherein the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with laser based transmitter;

a serial communication bus (15 and 16) distinct from the data transmit line and data receive line (see paragraph [0028], serial clock (SCL) and serial data (SDA) create serial communication bus);

a microprocessor (102) coupled to the serial communication bus, the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address (see paragraph [0014], Aronson et al disclose that the transceiver (GBIC) stores serial ID that can be read out via serial interface consisting of clock and data line or serial communication bus; the serial ID can be considered as address of the IC controller or microprocessor); and,

an optical driver (105) coupled to the optical source, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting a swing amplitude of the optical driver in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see paragraphs [0028-0029] and [0032-0033]; as shown Fig. 2, the controller is coupled to the communication bus (15 and 16) and to the laser driver (105)).

Regarding claim 2, Aronson et al disclose the optical source is supplied with a bias current, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the bias current of the optical source in accordance with the one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see paragraphs [0028-0029] and

[0032-0033]; as shown Fig. 2, the controller is coupled to the communication bus (15 and 16) and to the laser driver (105)).

Regarding claims 3, 6 and 16, Aronson et al disclose the optical detector has an electrical bandwidth, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the electrical bandwidth of the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see paragraph [0045]; the rate selection signal is the command received by the controller to adjust the bandwidth).

Regarding claims 9, 19 and 27, Aronson et al disclose that the serial communication bus is a two-wire bus (see paragraph [0028]).

Regarding claims 10, 20 and 28, Aronson et al disclose that the control signal is an output voltage from the microprocessor (see paragraph [0032], the controller has multiplicity of D/A converters which may be implemented using voltage sources, therefore output voltage from the controller).

Regarding claims 13 and 23, the optoelectronic transceiver of claim 1, wherein the optical source is a laser diode (see paragraph [0013]).

Regarding claims 14 and 24, Aronson et al disclose that the optical driver is an integrated circuit (see paragraph [0026]).

Regarding claim 15, Aronson et al disclose an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 2 comprising:

a data transmit line coupled to an optical source (103);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (102);

a serial communication bus (15 and 16) distinct from the data transmit line and data receive line (see paragraph [0028], serial clock (SCL) and serial data (SDA) create serial communication bus);

a microprocessor (102) coupled to the serial communication bus, the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address (see paragraph [0014], Aronson et al disclose that the transceiver (GBIC) stores serial ID that can be read out via serial interface consisting of clock and data line or serial communication bus; the serial ID can be considered as address of the IC controller or microprocessor); and,

the optical source supplied with bias current, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the bias current of the optical source in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see paragraphs [0032-0033]; D/A converter is used to directly control the laser bias current).

Regarding claim 25, Aronson et al disclose an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 2 comprising:

a data transmit line coupled to an optical source (103);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (102);

a serial communication bus (15 and 16) distinct from the data transmit line and data receive line (see paragraph [0028], serial clock (SCL) and serial data (SDA) create serial communication bus);

a microprocessor (102) coupled to the serial communication bus, the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address (see paragraph [0014], Aronson et al

disclose that the transceiver (GBIC) stores serial ID that can be read out via serial interface consisting of clock and data line or serial communication bus; the serial ID can be considered as address of the IC controller or microprocessor); and,

the optical detector has an electrical bandwidth, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the electrical bandwidth of the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see paragraph [0045]; the rate selection signal is the command received by the controller to adjust the bandwidth).

Regarding claim 29, Aronson et al disclose the controller has multiplicity of D/A converter, which control laser bias current (see paragraph [0032]), therefore the D/A is a resistive network.

Regarding claim 30, Aronson et al disclose the controller has multiplicity of D/A converter, (see paragraph [0032]), the controller, which include the D/A converter, is an integrated circuit, therefore it is well known that integrated circuit is comprised of transistors.

Regarding claim 31, Aronson et al disclose optical detector, since the optical detector receives optical signal or lightwave, therefore it is inherent that the optical detector is a pin (photo intrinsic) diode.

Regarding claim 32 (as far as understood), Aronson et al disclose the controller has multiplicity of D/A converter, which control laser bias current (see paragraph [0032]), the controller, which include the D/A converter, is an integrated circuit, therefore it is well known that integrated circuit is comprised of transistors.

Regarding claim 33, as discussed above, the D/A converter receives control signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 13-15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (US Patent No. 6,629,638) in view of Gilliland et al (US Patent No. 6,554,492).

Regarding claim 1, Sanchez discloses an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 3, comprising:

a data transmit line (20) coupled to an optical source (274);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (3) (it would have been obvious that there exist a data received line so that the photodiode is able to received the signal), wherein the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with laser based transmitter;

an input/output interface (317) distinct from the data transmit line and data receive line (see col. 8, lines 30-33, Sanchez discloses input/output interface, it would have been obvious to provide such interface as serial communication bus);

a microprocessor (305) coupled to the serial communication bus; and,

an optical driver (350) coupled to the optical source, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the a swing amplitude of the optical driver in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see col. 9, lines 66-67 to col. 10, lines 1-13; the adjustment of the driver provide variation on the amplitude level of the optical signal, therefore results in "swing amplitude"; in col. 8, lines 30-33, Sanchez disclose that the input/output interface received control signal, it would have been obvious to consider that such control signal is command signal).

Sanchez discloses processor as discussed above and differs from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not disclose that the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address. However, it is well known to provide serial address to processor. Gilliland et al is cited to show such well known concept. In col. 5, lines 2-7, Gilliland et al disclose assigning address to module. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide address to the module such as microprocessor or processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to identify a particular device.

Regarding claim 2, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows that the optical source (274) is supplied with a bias current (I_{DC}), the microprocessor providing a control signal (D_1) for adjusting the bias current of the optical source in accordance with the one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (in col. 8, lines 30-33, Sanchez disclose that the input/output interface received control

signal, therefore it would have been obvious to consider that such control signal is command signal).

Regarding claims 9, 19, 27 and 35, as discussed above Sanchez discloses input/output interface, which is considered as serial communication bus, and differ from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not specifically disclose that the serial communication bus is a two-wire bus. However, in communication system it is well know to provide two-wire bus. Gilliland et al teach such well known concept. In col. 1, lines 48-51, Gilliland et al disclose two-wire bus. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide two-wire bus as the input/output interface of Sanchez. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order provide easier access.

Regarding claims 10 and 20, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows that the control signal (D_1, D_2, D_3 and D_4) is an output voltage from the microprocessor (it would have been obvious that such signals comprise of voltage level).

Regarding claims 11 and 21, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows that the control signal is a voltage from a resistor network wherein the resistor network receives an output voltage from the microprocessor (the output from the microprocessor (305) is transmitted to DAC circuit which comprise of internal circuit components; it is well known that circuit component posses resistance; therefore the circuit element within DAC circuit form a resistive network).

Regarding claims 13 and 23, Sanchez discloses that the optical source is a laser diode (see col. 7, lines 51-52).

Regarding claims 14 and 24, the combination of Sanchez and Gilliland et al discloses optical driver (350) (see Fig. 3 of Sanchez) and differ from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not specifically disclose that the driver is an integrated circuit. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide integrated driver. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to provide energy efficient and cost saving system.

Regarding claim 15, Sanchez discloses an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 3, comprising:

a data transmit line (20) coupled to an optical source (274);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (3) (it would have been obvious that there exist a data received line so that the photodiode is able to received the signal), wherein the optical detector is configured to operate in connection with laser based transmitter;

an input/output interface (317) distinct from the data transmit line and data receive line (see col. 8, lines 30-33, Sanchez discloses input/output interface, it would have been obvious to provide such interface as serial communication bus);

a microprocessor (305) coupled to the serial communication bus; and,

the optical source supplied with a bias current, the microprocessor providing a control signal for adjusting the bias current of the optical source in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus (see col. 9, lines 52-65; in col. 8, lines 30-33, Sanchez discloses that the input/output

interface received control signal, therefore it would have been obvious to consider that such control signal is command signal).

Sanchez discloses processor as discussed above and differs from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not disclose that the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address. However, it is well known to provide serial address to processor. Gilliland et al is cited to show such well known concept. In col. 5, lines 2-7, Gilliland et al disclose assigning address to module. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide address to the module such as microprocessor or processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to identify a particular device.

Regarding claim 43 (as far as understood), Sanchez discloses an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 3, comprising:

a data transmit line (20) coupled to an optical source (274);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (3) (it would have been obvious that there exist a data received line so that the photodiode is able to received the signal);

a microprocessor (305) coupled to the serial communication bus; and,

an optical detector (270) has an electrical bandwidth (it would have been obvious that the optical detector has electrical bandwidth since it can only receive limited spectrum of the optical signal).

Sanchez discloses processor as discussed above and differs from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not disclose that the microprocessor corresponding to a

serial address. However, it is well known to provide serial address to processor. Gilliland et al is cited to show such well known concept. In col. 5, lines 2-7, Gilliland et al disclose assigning address to module. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide address to the module such as microprocessor or processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to identify a particular device.

Furthermore, the combination of Sanchez and Gilliland et al disclose optical communication in which the optoelectronic transceiver is capable of interoperating with a first other transceiver utilizing laser based transmitters.

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Sanchez and Gilliland et al differs from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose that the optoelectronic transceiver can transmit and receive data at rates ranging from 16 Mb/s to 1.25 Gb/s. However, in col. 27, lines 57-59, Sanchez discloses operation in the GHz range. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to provide such range in order to receive signal of various bit rates.

Regarding claim 45, the combination of Sanchez and Gilliland et al differs from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose the optoelectronic transceiver is compatible with signals having optical power levels in a range from about -3 dB to about -15 dB. However, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows power of the laser is adjustable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the power of the laser such that power

levels in a range from about -3 dB to about -15 dB. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to provide a desired range of power level.

12. Claims 12, 22, 30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (US Patent No. 6,629,638) in view of Gilliland et al (US Patent No. 6,554,492) and further in view of Banniza et al (US Patent No. 5,680,060).

Regarding claims 12, 22, 30 and 38, the combination of Sanchez and Gilliland et al discloses digital to analog converter (DAC) which comprises of resistor network and differ from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose that the resistor network includes a transistor. However, it is well known that resistor network such as the digital to analog converter comprise of transistor. Banniza et al is cited to show such well known concept. In col. 6, lines 16-25, Banniza et al disclose digital to analog converter comprising of transistor. Therefore, it would have been obvious that the resistor network such as the digital to analog converter of Sanchez comprised of transistor. The motivation of providing transistor for the resistor network to increase speed.

13. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 17, 18, 26, 34-42 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez (US Patent No. 6,629,638) in view of Gilliland et al (US Patent No. 6,554,492) and further in view of Ewen et al (US Patent No. 6,862,322).

Regarding claim 34 (as far as understood), Sanchez discloses an optoelectronic transceiver, as shown in Fig. 3, comprising:

a data transmit line (20) coupled to an optical source (274);

a data receive line coupled to an optical detector (3) (it would have been obvious that there exist a data received line so that the photodiode is able to received the signal);

a microprocessor (305) coupled to the serial communication bus; and,

an optical detector (270) has an electrical bandwidth (it would have been obvious that the optical detector has electrical bandwidth since it can only receive limited spectrum of the optical signal).

Sanchez discloses processor as discussed above and differs from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not disclose that the microprocessor corresponding to a serial address. However, it is well known to provide serial address to processor. Gilliland et al is cited to show such well known concept. In col. 5, lines 2-7, Gilliland et al disclose assigning address to module. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide address to the module such as microprocessor or processor. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to identify a particular device.

Furthermore, the combination of Sanchez et al and Gilliland et al differs from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose a plurality of filter components, the microprocessor providing control signals to the filter components for coupling to the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by

the microprocessor via the serial communication bus. Ewen et al disclose switchable filter and control line (see col. 6, lines 23-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the controllable filter components as taught by Ewen et al to the system of the combination. The control signal of such filter component could have been provided by the microprocessor found in the system of the combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to provide adjustable bandwidth to the optical receiver.

Regarding claim 35, as discussed above Sanchez discloses input/output interface, which is considered as serial communication bus, and differ from the claimed invention in that Sanchez does not specifically disclose that the serial communication bus is a two-wire bus. However, in communication system it is well know to provide two-wire bus. Gilliland et al teach such well known concept. In col. 1, lines 48-51, Gilliland et al disclose two-wire bus. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide two-wire bus as the input/output interface of Sanchez. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order provide easier access.

Regarding claim 36, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows that the control signal (D_1, D_2, D_3 and D_4) is an output voltage from the microprocessor (it would have been obvious that such signals comprise of voltage level).

Regarding claim 37, as shown in Fig. 3, Sanchez shows that the control signal is a voltage from a resistor network wherein the resistor network receives an output

voltage from the microprocessor (the output from the microprocessor (305) is transmitted to DAC circuit which comprise of internal circuit components; it is well known that circuit component posses resistance; therefore the circuit element within DAC circuit form a resistive network).

Regarding claim 38, the optoelectronic transceiver wherein the resistor network includes a transistor (since transistors is used in IC circuit, therefore it would have been obvious that the resistive network includes transistors in order to provide compact design).

Regarding claim 39, as discussed above, in Fig. 4B, Ewen et al further show that the that filter components includes resistive and capacitive devices.

Regarding claim 40, as discussed above, in Fig. 4B, Ewen et al further show that the filter components includes transistors.

Regarding claim 41, as discussed above, in Fig. 4B, Ewen et al further show that the transistors are field effect transistors.

Regarding claim 42 (as far as understood), Sanchez discloses that the optoelectronic transceiver is capable of interoperating with a first other transceiver utilizing laser based transmitters.

Regarding claim 46 (as far as understood), the combination of Sanchez, Gilliland et al and Ewen et al disclose that the optoelectronic transceiver is compatible for communication with transceivers that employ an LED as an optical emitter, and with transceivers that employ a laser as an optical emitter.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 26, the combination of Sanchez et al and Gilliland et al differs from the claimed invention in that the combination does not disclose a plurality of filter components, the microprocessor providing control signals to the filter components for coupling to the optical detector in accordance with one or more commands received by the microprocessor via the serial communication bus. Ewen et al disclose switchable filter and control line (see col. 6, lines 23-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the controllable filter components as taught by Ewen et al to the system of the combination. The control signal of such filter component could have been provided by the microprocessor found in the system of the combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do such in order to provide adjustable bandwidth to the optical receiver.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalzid Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3029. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272--3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DS
February 21, 2006

A. Bello

AGUSTIN BELLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER